DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 927 EA 020 609

AUTHOR Hodge, Susie L.
TITLE A Study of the Attitudes and Perceptions of Principals toward the Adopt-a-School Program and Related Program Characteristics.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Louisville, KY, November 8-11, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Analysis of Variance; *Attitude Measures; Community Involvement; *Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Principals; *School Business Relationship; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Adopt A School Program

ABSTRACT

The study summarized herein was undertaken to determine the attitudes and perceptions of principals toward the adopt-a-school program, the program characteristics of school adoptions, and the factors contributing to the maintenance and improvement of present and future partnerships between schools and communities. The one-way analysis of variance, ANOVA, was the statistical test used in testing the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. The results revealed, first, a relationship between the type of adoptor and (1) the perceived extent of satisfaction with the program and (2) the perception that the adopt-a-school program provides useful motivational activities. A relationship exists between the attitude toward community involvement in general and the attitude that the adopt-a-school program fosters within the community in support of the public schools. A relationship also exists between the teaching staff size of the school and the number of adoptor organizations in the school. Statistical tables are included, along with a bibliography. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302927

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS TOWARD THE ADOPT-A-SCHOOL PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

A DISSERTATION SUMMARY

PRESENTED TO

THE MID-SOUTH

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. L. Hodge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BY

DR. SUSIE L. HODGE

EA020609

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS TOWARD THE ADOPT-A-SCHOOL PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

A SUMMARY

PRESENTED TO

MID-SOUTH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

BY

DR. SUSIE LEE HODGE

NOVEMBER, 1988

In recent years, numerous periodicals have carried accounts of the failure of the public educational system. Support for public schools in terms of commitment and finances is decreasing. Education is often viewed as a delivery system that has failed to deliver a service. Blame for the plight of public education has been placed alternately on teachers, administrators, and faculty members in university preparation programs.[1] Education has been conceived as a governmental service delivery system: we have set up government-run, professionally staffed bureaus to "deliver" education to our children.[2] The unsatisfactory results from a service-delivery system prompt us to attempt to solve the problem by delivering more services; or by making the service-delivery machinery either more efficient, through improved technology, or more accountable, through political action or better management.

The "partnership concept" in education is accepted in many of the nation's school districts a means to foster community involvement and educational improvement. There are various definitions and classifications of the term partnership.

---

[1]Martha M. McCarthy and George D. Kuh, "Where is the Public in Public Education?" American School Board Journal, 55: 267-68, June, 1981.

[2]David S. Seeley, "Education Through Partnership," Educational Leadership, 40: 42-43, November, 1982.

According to O'Connell, partnerships are voluntary, long-term relationships between the private sector and a school or school district.[3] O'Connell further states that partnerships can be whatever schools want them to be. The author cites four general categories of partnerships. The first category includes individual or classroom partnerships involving one business and one school. A second category includes total district partnerships involving many partners in many schools. Partnerships that involve monetary or material contributions to the schools for special projects are included in the third category. The fourth category includes education programs initiated by business and made available to schools.

Partnerships that are not usually seen as business/education partnership programs also encourage the development of closer linkages with the schools. Volunteerism is a strategy for promoting business/education partnerships. Many partnerships between the school and community involve volunteer organizations in addition to business organizations. In some partnerships there is a direct link between business and the school volunteer program. In programs such as the adopt-a-school, a group or organizational project exists. In other partnerships, released time or loan personnel from businesses donate gifts in the form of dollars or materials. Chaffee states,"adopt-a-school"

---

[3]Jerrald Shive and Joseph F. Rogus, "The School-Business Partnership: A Concept Revitalized," Clearing House, 52: 286-20, February, 1978.

[4]Elizabeth A. Purcell, Partners for the 80's: Business and Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 208 222, 1981.

is a common label for the one-on-one partnership between a business, organization or agency and a single school.[5] Chaffee further states, the genius of the adopt-a-school or partnership approach to school business collaboration is its simplicity.[6]

A second definition states, "Adopt-a-school programs are models of school-community involvement and cooperation in which businesses, organizations, and industries adopt schools and contribute funds, personnel, or expertise to those schools for programs, projects and services.[7] Adopt-a-school programs exist within each geographical division of the United States. Approximately half of the programs exist in the South Atlantic states. Adopt-a-school programs exist in more heavily populated areas. In recent years, efforts are being made to provide national organization and coordination for adopt-a-school or partnership activities.

The theoretical importance of community involvement is documented in the literature. However, there is little information concerning the thoughts and conceptions of one of the individuals most responsible for meaningful involvement in the adopt-a-school program--the school principal. The principal is often cited as the key to effective change in the school. Because the principal

---

[5]John Chaffee, Jr., Business-School Partnerships. A Plus For Kids Education U.S.A. Special Report, U.S.A. Special Report, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 198 354, 1981.

[6]Chaffee, p. 2, 1981.

[7]Santee C. Ruffin, School-Business Partnerships: Why Not? Laying The Foundation for Successful Programs, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 238 148, 1983.

is responsible for evaluation of teachers, the supervision of the instructional program, the communications with the school community and the establishment of schedules and routines, he or she has the power to facilitate or to inhibit change.[8] The principal of each elementary and secondary school carries the responsibility for improving educational quality within that school.[9] According to Williams, educators are challenged to provide clear goals and priorities for improving education, upgrade expectations for children, and maintain skills required to improve education, and educate all students in skills essential to ecenomic productivity. Educators should collaborate as never before with govenors, legislators, business and labor leaders and citizens to strengthen schools. No single style of management is appropriate for all schools, and principals must find the styles and structures that are best suited to their own situations.[10]

Knowledge concerning program characteristics of school adoptions should enable educators to identify specific kinds of activities provided to students through involvement in the adopt-a-school program. School adoption activities associated with the principal's positive or negative attitudes toward the

---

[8]Wilma F. Smith, The Principal: Key to Change in the School, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 244 725, 1981.

[9]B. Williams, Action for Principals, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 235 547, 1983.

[10]Carol Murphy, Effective Principals: Knowledge, Talent, Spirit of Inquiry, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 234 521, 1983.

program should be identified. Finally, knowledge of the characteristics of school adoptions would provide useful information for educators who wish to implement new adoptions or improve existing adoptions. Educators should determine ways to maintain and improve present and future partnerships between schools and communities. The tremendous potential that solid partnerships between schools and businesses represent dictates the need for a systematic approach to development and maintenance."[11]

Statement of the Problem

Educators need to know (1) the principal's attitudes and perceptions toward the adopt-a-school program, (2) the program characteristics of school adoptions, and (3) the factors contributing to the maintenance and improvement of present and future partnerships between schools and communities. They need to understand the dynamics of the adopt-a-school program and the potential influence such knowledge could have on implementation of new adoptions, as well as improve existing ones.

Educators also need to know which program attributes set some school programs apart form others and which attributes are viewed as common to adopt-a-school programs within the same school system. There is a need for further understanding of the relationship between the views of school administrators toward the adopt-a-school program and identifiable program traits which serve as the bases for such views. This information could aid

---

[11]Santee C. Ruffin, Jr. School-Business Partnerships: Why Not? Laying the Foundation for Successful Programs. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 238 148, 1983.

in the determination of actions and strategies which are likely to make present and future partnerships succussful.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine (a) the attitudes and perceptions of the principal toward the adopt-a-school program (b) the program characteristics of school adoptions, and (c) the factors contributing to the maintenance and improvement of present and future partnerships between schools and communities.

School cooperative programs such as the adopt-a-school program are flourishing in many school systems across the nation. In order to provide a means of support for such programs, information on the attitudes and perceptions of the person most responsible for the success of the school program-- the principal-- is needed. A clear understanding of the principal's role in implementing new programs and educational strategies is also needed. Knowledge of the characteristics of the school program will contribute insight concerning particular features of the program as it operates in the school.

Significance of the Study

The problem investigated in this study is of great importance to educational leaders and others who are concerned with programs and activities that supplement public education through increased community support. Additionally, the study is significant because it may promote new successful partnerships which can improve public education. The study provides information that may enhance the value of existing partnerships that need improvement.

School systems have need for resources to maintain standards that promote quality in public education. Partnerships can be valuable supplements to the public educational systems in periods of financial decline and limited resources. Communities can provide support for schools which includes, but is not limited to on-the-job training direct participation in instruction, awards to students and teachers, scholarships, and equipment loans.

A study of partnership efforts, such as the adopt-a-school program, reveals a nontraditional concept that has value in terms of solving or partially solving the resource problem. Resource needs fall into three major areas. These areas include human, material, and financial resources. The findings from this study will help determine how partnership efforts, such as the adopt-a-school program, can successfully supplement these needs and thereby increase the overall quality of education.

In particular, the study provides valuable information concerning the program and its characteristics as perceived by the school principal. The attitudes and perceptions of the school principal are useful to the success of the partnership effort because the principal provides leadership and support for programs and activities within the school.

While the subject of school improvement has gained renewed attention after several years of dormancy, research findings have emerged that add to our knowledge concerning the process of change. These findings can be used to increase success rates

of emerging efforts to improve schools, and avoid repeating previous implementation failures. This study provides valuable information concerning the attitudes and perceptions of principals which support an increase in the success rates of emerging partnership efforts. Most importantly, this study helps us determine what must be known and done to make partnerships successful.

METHODOLOGY

The methods employed in fulfilling the purpose of the study are summarized on the following pages. The three major divisions of the summary include: (1) determination of population and sample, (2) development of the research instrument, and (3) analysis of data.

Determination of Population and Sample

The target population for this study includes all school principals in the Memphis City Public School System. The span of grades under the auspicies of the Memphis City School Board includes grades kindergarten through twelve. In addition, there are two special education and eight adult vocational schools. Responses from these schools are not included in the study because of inherent differences in their programs. This study is delimited to the Memphis City Schools in the 1985-86 school year. The schools within the study have grades within the K-12 range.

Instrumentation

The three-part Adopt-A-School Questionnaire was designed to obtain information concerning (1) selected demographic variables,

(2) program characteristics of school adoptions, and (3) attitudes and perceptions of school principals toward the adopt-a-school program. The questionnaire was also designed to determine factors which contribute to the maintenance and improvement of present and future partnerships between schools and communities. The data gathered from the questionnaire served as the base for testing the 7 questions and 6 major hypotheses for the study. Six supplementary hypotheses were developed to help analyze Hypotheses VI. Additionally the secondary analysis includes the separate analysis of each dependent variable for Hypotheses I-V. The One-Way Analysis of Variance, ANOVA, is the statistical test used in testing the hypotheses for the primary and secondary analyses. The questionnaire items were developed from a detailed study of the literature. Selected items from related questionnaires were used as references for development of the questionnaire. Some questionnaire items were obtained and revised from the Community Involvement Assessment form which was used in a dissertation by Willis Herman Crosby, Jr.[12]

A panel of experts was selected to critique the questionnaire, and to offer suggestions concerning validity and reliability. The panel of experts included the adopt-a-school director, one principal, and two assistant principals. Suggestions from the panel of experts were considered to make needed revisions in the questionnaire.

---

[12]Willis Herman Crosby, Jr. "A Survey of Principal Attitudes Toward Community Involvement in a Southern Public School System." (Ed.D dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1977), p. 95.

Data Collection

In April, 1986, the Adopt-A-School Questionnaire was approved and subsequently mailed to all principals. Two weeks later, a follow-up letter was mailed to encourage principals to return the questionnaires. Following another two-week period; a second questionnaire was mailed to principals who did not respond to the initial questionnaire. Finally, a telephone call was made to all principals who did not respond.

By June 1, 1986, one hundred and forty-six questionnaires were returned. The 6 responses from principals of vocational/ technical schools were not included because of the inherent differences in school programs. The 2 responses from principals of special education schools were not included because of inherent differences in their programs. The 3 responses from principals with no adoptors were not included in the study. There were 135 responses used in the study. Responses from 88 elementary, 20 junior high, and 27 senior high school principals were used in the statistical analysis for this study.

Statistical Analysis

Usable information was entered in a data file in the Sperry 1100/62 computer. The program used was Statistical Package for the Social Sciences X, (SPSS X), Release 2.0. The tables in Chapter 4 of the study contain the data collected for the study.

The questionnaire contains three major divisions. The first division is designed to obtain descriptive information about the respondent. Multiple choice items pertaining to the adopt-a-school program constitute the second division. Attitudinal

questions pertaining to the adopt-a-school program are found in the last division. Possible responses to attitudinal questionnaire items, which are rated on a 1-6 scale, include disagree strongly, disagree moderately, disagree slightly, agree slightly, agree moderately, agree strongly.

The null hypotheses and methods of statistical analysis are stated on the following pages. The school setting prompts the data analyst to consider several external factors that are reported to influence leadership activities. These factors provide alternatives for the analyst to explore. External factors help to describe the particular school setting of the principal. These factors, which are called descriptors, are summarized in frequencies and percentages. The questionnaire items pertaining to the demographic variables include items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Responses to item 19 as related to Hypothesis VI were analyzed by grouping according to the demographic data yielded by items 1 through 6. Item 19 was selected for this purpose because of the researcher's general interest in the adopt-a-school program and its relationship to community involvement.

Research Questions

This is a descriptive study predicated on the following research questions.

1. What is the relationship between the principal's attitude toward community involvement through the adopt-a-school program and the principal's attitude toward community involvement in general?

2. What is the relationship between the principal's commitment to program goals and objectives and the perceived extent of program evaluation?

3. What is the relationship between the principal's program satisfaction and the type of adoptor?

4. What is the relationship between the principal's involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the number of teachers in the school?

5. What is the relationship between the principal's involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the percentage of low income students in the school?

6. What is the relationship between the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program and selected variables?

The following research question is treated by reporting descriptive data:

a. divisional level of the school?

b. nature of student participation?

c. type of adoptor?

d. communication between school and adoptor?

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses are designed to facilitate addressing the research questions of this study except for question 7, that is answered directly in descriptive treatment.

Hypothesis I. There is no relationship between the principal's attitude toward community involvement through the

adopt-a-school program and the principal's attitude toward community involvement in general.

Hypothesis II. There is no relationship between the principal's commitment to program goals and objectives and the perceived extent of program evaluation.

Hypothesis III. There is no relationship between the principal's program satisfaction and the type of adoptor--profit-making or non-profit.

Hypothesis IV. There is no relationship between the principal's extent of involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the number of teachers in the school.

Hypothesis V. There is no relationship between the principal's involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the percentage of low income students in the school.

Hypothesis VI. There is no relationship between the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program and the following variables:

a. the principal's number of years of experience.
b. the principal's number of years of program involvement.
c. the principal's sex category.
d. number of workshops, inservices, or conventions (meetings) attended by the principal.
e. divisional level of the school.
f. primary program emphasis of the adoption.

Supplementary Hypotheses

Hypothesis VI includes the following supplementary hypotheses:

1. There is no relationship between the principal's years of experience and the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program.

2. There is no relationship between the principal's number of years of program involvement and the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program.

3. There is no relationship between the principal's sex category and the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program.

4. There is no relationship between the number of workshops and in-services (meetings) attended by the principal and the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program.

5. There is no relationship between the divisional level of the school and the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program.

6. There is no relationship between the primary program emphasis of the adoption and the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a-school program.

The null hypotheses and analytical procedures are presented here.

H_1 There is no relationship between the principal's attitude toward community involvement through the adopt-a-school program and the principal's attitude toward community involvement in general.

The independent variable is the attitude toward community involvement in general. The dependent variable is the attitude toward community involvement through the adopt-a-school program. The One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypothesis, and utilized responses for items 15-18 (independent variable) and 37-40 (dependent variable).

H_2There is no relationship between the principal's perceived extent of commitment to program goals and objectives and the perceived extent of program evaluation.

The independent variable is extent of program evaluation. The dependent variable is extent of commitment to program goals and objectives. The One-Way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis, and utilized the responses for items 25-30 (independent variable) and items 31-36 (dependent variable).

H_3There is no relationship between the principal's extent of program satisfaction and the type of adoptor--profit-making or non-profit or both.

The independent variable is the type of adoptor. The dependent variable is the program satisfaction. The repeated measures procedure was used to test this hypothesis, and utilized the responses to items 12 (independent variable) and 19-24 (dependent variable).

H_4There is no relationship between the principal's perceived extent of involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the number of teachers in the school.

The independent variable is the teaching staff size of the school. The dependent variable is the extent of involvement. The

One Way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis. The number of teachers was obtained from the 1985-86 Memphis City Schools Directory. The responses to the item--number of teachers in each school were placed in the following groups.

A	67-100% high	large staff
B	34-66% medium	medium staff
C	0-33% low	small staff

Response categories for the dependent variable--extent of involvement were derived from items 7-11, 13, and 14. Items which measure the dependent variable-extent of involvement, in hypotheses 4 and 5, were weighted in order to provide a means of classification. Responses to items 7-11, 13, and 14, are combined to give a single number as the index of perceived extent of involvement. The index provides a basis to differentiate and scale responses. A total of weights assigned to responses of a school allows classification of a school as most involved, relatively involved, least involved. Simply stated the categories are described as low, medium, and high. Each questionnaire item has three possible responses which are labeled a, b, and c. Weights assigned to responses include: (1) least preferred response, (2) the intermediate response, (3) the most preferred response. The numbers assigned as weights are arbitrary and do not change the outcome of the operation. The assigned weights for questionnaire items are as follows:

Questionnaire Items	Weights		
	A	B	C
Q7	3	1	2
Q8	3	2	1
Q11	1	2	3
Q14	2	1	3

Items 9, 10, and 13 are clearly ordered as they appear in the questionnaire. The possible responses to item 9 are (a) increased--the most preferred response, (b) decreased--the least preferred response, and (c) remained the same--the intermediate response.

The possible responses to item 10 are (a) long range--most preferable response, (b) intermediate range--next most preferable response, (c) short range--the next most preferable response, and (d) target range--the least preferred response. The possible responses to item 13 include:

(a) one--the least preferred response

(b) two--the intermediate response

(c) Three or more--the most preferred response.

H_5 There is no relationship between the perceived extent of involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the percentage of low income students in the school.

The independent variable is the percentage of low income students in the school. The dependent variable is the extent of

involvement. The One Way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis. The independent variable--percentage of low income students in the school--was identified from a listing supplied by the Division of Compensatory Education of the Memphis City Board of Education. The responses to the item--percentage of low income students in the school--were placed in the following groups.

A	67-100%	high	Large
B	34-66%	medium	Medium
C	0-33%	low	Small

The dependent variable--perceived extent of involvement in the adopt-a-school program, was measured from responses to items 7-11, 13, and 14. The responses to these questionnaire items are weighted as stated for the fourth hypothesis.

H_6There is no relationship between the principal's perception of community involvement fostered by the adopt-a- school program and the following variables:

a. the principal's years of experience.
b. the principal's number of years of program involvement
c. the principal's sex category.
d. number of workshops, inservices or conventions (meetings) attended by the principal.
e. divisional level of the school.
f. primary program emphasis of the adoption.

Items one through six provide information which describes the demographic data. Responses to items were analyzed by grouping

them according to demographic data as yielded by items 1 through 6. The One Way Analysis of Variance was used to analyze the data for each demographic (independent variable). Statement 19 (dependent variable) was chosen because of (1) interest to the researcher and (2) the importance of this perception to the adopt-a-school programs which is determined through the literature.

Testing of Hypotheses

The primary analysis includes a discussion of responses to questionnaire items by principals within three categories--low, medium, high. The frequency distribution is used to place responses to the items which relate to the independent variable into each of the three categories. Responses to questionnaire items which relate to the dependent variable are summed to provide a single index of measurement.

Responses to questionnaire items 1 to 14 are based on multiple choices. Responses to items 15-40 are based on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 6. Response choices include desagree strongly, disagree moderately, disagree slightly, agree slightly, agree moderately, and agree strongly.

The secondary analysis provides additional information for each hypothesis. The One-Way Analysis of Variance,ANOVA, is the statistical test used in testing the hypotheses. The independent variable for each hypothesis is divided into three categories--low, medium, and high. Responses to questionnaire items which relate to the independent variable are placed into categories by means of the frequency distribution. Responses which relate to the

dependent variable for each hypothesis are analyzed separately in the secondary analysis. A secondary analysis was not completed for Hypothesis VI. Hypothesis VI was addressed in the primary analysis.

Primary Analysis

No significant differences were found for 5 of the 6 major hypotheses after testing using the ANOVA procedure. Significant differences were found after testing Hypothesis III at the .05 level using the ANOVA procedure. A summary for statistical data for Hypothesis III is presented in Tables 1 and 2. A summary of the analysis of variance is presented in Table 1. The resulting F ratio for (df=2, 121) is 3.3481. The null hypothesis is rejected at the .05 level of significance. There is a relationship between those who are categorized by type of adoptor--profit-making, non-profit, or a combination of both, and the perceived extent of program satisfaction.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance for Hypothesis III

Source	df	Sum of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2	176.9302	3.3481*	.0384
Within Groups	121	3107.1585	26.4228	
Total	123	3374.0087		

p .05

A summary of the frequencies, means, and standard deviations for Hypothesis III is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Statistical Data for Hypothesis III

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Profit-Making Adoptor	55	28.5091	6.1700
Non-Profit Adoptor	46	30.8913	4.4133
Combination of Both Types of Adoptors	23	30.9565	3.4704
Total	124	29.8468	5.2375

The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure was used as a follow-up measure. Principals categorized by non-profit adoptors score significantly higher on the perceived extent of program satisfaction than principals categorized by profit making adoptors. There is a relationship between the type of adoptor and the perceived extent of program satisfaction.

Secondary Analyses which Reveal Significance

ANOVA procedures which reveal significance at the .05 level are discussed in the following pages. Significant differences were found after testing Hypotheses I, III, IV, and V in the secondary analysis.

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I states: "There is no relationship between the principal's attitude toward community involvement through the adopt-a-school program and the principal's attitude toward community involvement in general." The independent variable is, "attitude toward community involvement in general." Three categories of the independent variable are low, medium, and high. The selected dependent variable is item 39 which states, "The adopt-a-school program influences the community to support the public schools."

A summary of statistical data is presented in Tables 3 and 4. A summary of the analysis of variance is presented Table 3. The resulting F ratio for (df=2, 127) is 6.3726. The researcher rejects the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. There is a relationship between those who are categorized as low, medium, or high on the attitude toward community involvement in general and the attitude that the adopt-a-school program influences the community to support the public schools.

The Tukey and Scheffe procedures were used as follow-up measures. Principals in the high category on community involvement in general score significantly higher on agreement that the adopt-a-school program influences the community to support the puboic schools than principals in the low category on community involvement in general. There is a relationship between the attitude toward community involvement in general and the attitude that the adopt-a-school program influences the community to support the public schools.

Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Hypothesis I,
Dependent Variable - Item 39
Independent Variable - Attitude
Toward Community Involvement
in General

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2	11.6460	5.8230	6.3726*	.0023
Within Groups	127	116.0463	.9138		
Total	129	127.6923			

*p .05

A summary of frequencies, means, and standard deviations is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Statistical Data for Hypothesis I
Dependent Variable - Item 39

Group	f	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low	39	4.8718	1.2603
Medium	36	5.3611	.7983
High	55	5.5818	.7862
Total	130	5.3077	.9949

Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III states: "There is no relationship between the principal's perceived extent of program satisfaction and the type of adoptor--profit-making, non-profit, or both. The independent variable is, "type of adoptor--profit-making, non-profit, or both." Three categories of the independent variable are low, medium, or high. The selected dependent variable is item 21 which states, "The adopt-a-school program provides useful motivational activities."

A summary of statistical data is provided in Tables 5 and 6. A summary of the analysis of variance is provided in Table 5. The resulting F ratio ($df=2, 121$) is 3.7451. The researcher rejects the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. There is a relationship between principals whose adoptors are categorized as profit-making, non-profit or both and the perception that the adopt-a-school program provides useful motivational activities.

The Tukey procedure was used as a follow-up measure. Principals with non-profit adoptors score significantly higher on agreement that the adopt-a-school program provides useful motivational activities than principals with profit-making adoptors. There is a relationship between the principal's perception that the adopt-a-school program provides useful motivational activities and the type of adoptor.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Hypothesis III,
Dependent Variable - Item 21
Independent Variable -
Extent of Program
Evaluation

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2	4.7026	2.3513	3.7451*	.0264
Within Groups	121	75.9668	.6278		
Total	123	80.6694			

*p .05

A summary of frequencies, means, and standard deviations is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Statistical Data for Hypothesis III
Dependent Variable - Item 21

Group	f	Mean	Standard Deviation
Profit-Making	55	5.1455	.9703
Non-Profit	46	5.5217	.6232
Both	23	5.5652	.5898
Total	124	5.3629	.8098

Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV states: "There is no relationship between the principal's perceived extent of involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the number of teachers in the school." The independent variable is, "the teaching staff size." Three categories of the independent variable are low, medium, and high. The selected dependent variable is item 13 which states, "The number of adoptor organizations in my school is/are . . ." The possible responses are one, two, three or more.

A summary of statistical data is provided in Tables 7 and 8. A summary of the analysis of variance is provided in Table 7. The resulting F ratio (df=2, 121) is 3.4015. The researcher rejects the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. There is a relationship between principals who are categorized as low, medium, or high on the size of the teaching staff and the number of adoptor organizations in the school.

The Tukey procedure was used as a follow-up measure. Principals in the high category on teaching staff size score significantly higher on the number of adoptor organizations in the school than principals in the low category on teaching staff size. There is a relationship between the teaching staff size of the school and the number of adoptor organizations in the school.

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Hypothesis IV,
Dependent Variable - Item 13
Independent Variable -
Type of Adoptor

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probality
Between Groups	2	1.0693	.5347	3.4015	.0365
Within Groups	121	19.0194	.1572		
Total	123	20.0087			

*p .05

A summary of frequencies, means, and standard deviations is presented in Table 8.

Table 8
Statistical Data for Hypothesis IV
Dependent Variable - Item 13

Group	f	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low	55	1.1091	.3146
Medium	46	1.1087	.3147
High	23	1.1532	.4041
Total	124	1.1532	.4041

Hypothesis V

Hypothesis V states: "There is no relationship between the principal's perceived extent of involvement in the adopt-a-school program and the percentage of low income students in the school." The independent variable is the percentage of low income students in the school." Three categories of the independent variable are low, medium, and high. The selected dependent variable is item 10 which states, Identify the one primary time range that best describes the duration of most adopt-a-school activities in your school." The choices are long, intermediate, short, and target range.

A summary of statistical data is provided in Tables 9 and 10. A summary of the analysis of variance is provided in Table 9. The resulting F ratio (df=2, 125) is 3.1991. The researcher rejects the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. There is a relationship between principals who are categorized as low, medium, or high on the percentage of low-income students in the school and the duration of most adopt-a-school activities in the school.

The Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure was used as a follow-up measure. Principals categorized by a low percentage of low income students score significantly higher on the time range or duration of most adopt-a-school activities in the school than principals categorized by a high percentage of low income students. There is a relationship between the percentage of low income students in the school and the time range that best describes the duration of most adopt-a-school activities.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance for Hypothesis V,
Dependent Variable - Item 10
Independent Variable - Percentage
of Low Income Students
in the School

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2	6.3115	3.1558	3.1991*	.0442
Within Groups	125	123.3057	.9864		
Total	127	129.6172			

* p .05

A summary of frequencies, means, and standard deviations is presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Statistical Data for Hypothesis V,
Dependent Variable - Item 10

Group	f	Mean	Standard Deviation
Low	41	1.8780	1.2287
Medium	43	1.3953	.8491
High	44	1.4091	.8712
Total	128	1.5547	1.0103

Conclusions and Implications

Important conclusions are derived which relate to the adopt-a-school program. The favorable attitude of principals toward the adopt-a-school program exists regardless of the attitude toward community involvement in general. The conclusion that principals favor the adopt-a-school program because of the practical usefulness in the school as opposed to an acceptance that is dependent on the theoretical concept of community involvement. Principals who favor the traditional concept of community involvement find the adopt-a-school program generates more support for the schools than their less favorable counterparts. A related conclusion is that some principals may benefit from information pertaining to the importance and usefulness of the program.

The adopt-a-school program is highly adaptable to a variety of school situations. Community involvement through the adopt-a-school program may be attained in an elementary, junior, or senior high school with little differentiation based on the divisional level of the school. The program is useful to principals in involving the community without respect to the different characteristics of principals such as levels of experience, years of program involvement, the number of meetings attended or sex of the principal. Principals are generally satisfied with the adopt-a-school program as it operates in the schools. However, principals with non-profit adoptors express greater satisfaction than profit-making adoptors.

It is evident that the adopt-a-school program provides the opportunity for students in grades K-12 to become involved

in meaningful program activities. The broad categories of student participation provide enrichment opportunities that are limited only by the needs of the school, resources of the adoptor, and basic school policy.

A broad spectrum of the community is represented through participation as adoptors in the program. A population of adoptors that represents supportive individuals, profit-making and non-profit adoptors, is an important element of total community support for the school. The continuous involvement of partners during the school year is supported by continuous two-way communication between adoptor and school representatives.

The maintenance and improvement of present and future partnerships is important. Planning a coordinated program within schools helps the partnership remain successful. Most principals recognize and understand the importance of establishing goals, objectives, and activities to developing a meaningful program. The generally high level of evaluation supports the conclusion that adoptors and schools are working to achieve the maintenance and improvement of partnerships in the schools.

Knowing that principals share similar levels of involvement in the program, regardless of the type of adoptor, supports the notion that program involvement is not dependent of the type of adoptor. The level of involvement may be more related to <u>how</u> partners use the available resources to meet planned goals and objectives than the kind of resources available.

Involvement is not dependent on school size or the socio-economic level of students. Adopt-a-school programs are feasible

in highly populated areas or communities as well as low population areas or communities. Principals of schools in various types of cultural and economic level communities may work with adoptors to develop programs and activities that provide meaningful involvement to all concerned. The adopt-a-school program may serve as a catalyst in the development of stability, increased community confidence and support to public schools.

Implications

As the adopt-a-school program continues to provide meaningful involvement to the community and useful learning opportunities, the program may become more meaningful to school principals and members of the community. Principals may increase their support of the program because of the tangible and intangible rewards. Adoptors will likely increase the level of involvement in future years as the program becomes more successful.

The program characteristics of school adoptions may change in the future. As school officials and adoptors experience positive results from partnership activities, the program may expand to central office departments. For example, seminars sponsored by health professionals on preventive medicine, training on the use of sophisticated computer equipment and techniques, information on management techniques and other services may be offered. Adoptors may also help train students in specific skills as the need for a more specialized and

competent work force tends to motivate businesses to increase involvement in public schools. Scholarships and college tuition loans may become available to students as adoptors identify future productive workers.

Adopt-a-school programs tend to grow as school systems across the country become aware of the potential advantages of the program. As partners collaborate to provide a better education for students, the image of the city may improve. Through citizen involvement, increased confidence in public schools will tend to promote growth and expansion of cities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chaffee, John Jr. Business School Partnerships. A Plus For Kids Education U.S.A. Special Report. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 198 354, 1981.

Crosby, Willis Herman Jr., "A Survey of Principal Attitudes Toward Community Involvement in a Southern Public School System." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1977.

McCarthy, Martha M. and George D. Kuh, "Where is the Public in Public Education?" American School Board Journal, 55:267-68. June, 1981.

Murphy, Carol. Effective Principals: Knowledge, Talent, Spirit of Inquiry. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 234 521, 1983.

Purcell, Elizabeth A. Partners for the 80's: Business and Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 208 222, 1981.

Ruffin, Santee C., Jr. School Business Partnerships: Why Not? Laying the Foundation for Successful Programs. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 238 148, 1983.

Seeley, David S. "Education Through Partnership." Educational Leadership, 40: 42-43. November, 1982.

Shive, Jerrald and Joseph F. Rogus, "The School-Business Partnership: A Concept Revitalized." Clearing House, 52:286-90, February, 1978.

Smith, Wilma F. The Principal: Key to Change in the School. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 244 725, 1981.

Williams, B. Action for Principals. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 235 547, 1983.